

REMARKS

Claims 1-8,11,13-19,21 and 23-30 are now pending in the application. Claims 26-30 are newly added. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-8, 11-21, and 23-25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Guo (U.S. Pat. No. 6,597,808) in view of the applicants admitted prior art. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 has been amended. The amended claim 1 now includes the recitation, "... wherein the associated digital information is displayed ... reproduce the user-drawn marks from which the associated digital information was generated". Applicants' invention is directed to an integrated system (e.g., "An integrated system for portraying and reproducing information on a surface", claim 1) where a whiteboard like panel allows user to seamlessly create, save, and index notes based on selected headings which can then be reproduced back on the whiteboard.

The Guo reference has been cited along with the present application's Figure 1. Guo's invention is directed to a technique for extracting regions in scanned documents that are demarcated by a user drawn circle. The Examiner has cited the present application's Figure 1 as combined with Guo in order to render claim 1 as obvious. Figures 1a and 1b of the present application represent simple whiteboards that include scanners in varying configurations. However, even if such a combination was possible, it will fail to teach an integrated whiteboard system where the user can select a stored

portion (header) of the previously drawn marks, upon which the “plotter [draws] marks [that] reproduce the user-drawn marks from which the associated digital information was generated”, claim 1.

In context of a plotter being used in the present invention, the Examiner, while rejecting now cancelled claim 12, has indicated that “The plotting machine is inherently capable of redisplaying...” (page 4, Office Action). Further, the Examiner has indicated that Saund (U.S. Patent No. 6,457,792) discloses a whiteboard printer.

However, the applicants’ invention is not at all directed to a stand alone plotting machine with such capabilities. The applicants’ invention is directed to an integrated system that allows the user to seamlessly create, save, and index notes based on selected headings which can then be reproduced back on the whiteboard. A stand-alone plotter that can merely print/plot incoming data does not have this capability. Further, neither Guo nor Saund references include any suggestion to a person skilled in the art for combining their respective inventions of circled region extraction and a suspended whiteboard plotter to achieve the applicants’ invention. Therefore, the Guo and Saund reference cannot be combined with the Figure 1 of the present application to render the amended claim 1 as obvious.

Therefore, claim 1 is allowable as per above reasons. The applicants respectfully request the examiner to allow claim 1. Claims 2-8, 11, 13-15 depend on claim 1, and are hence allowable for at least the same reason as claim 1.

Applicants have amended claim 16. As amended the claim 16 includes the recitation, “...creating the user-drawn marks in response to user-selection of the index information”. As explained above in context of claim 1, Guo is directed to a different

purpose of extracting circled region, and unlike the method of claim 16 it does not disclose an integrated system of creating, saving, and retrieving user-marks. Following the reasoning discussed above in context of claim 1, claim 16 as amended is in an allowable condition. Applicants therefore respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of claim 16. Further, claims 17-19 and 21 depend on claim 16 and hence are allowable for at least the same reason as claim 16.

The Examiner has rejected claims 23-25 because the "...claim is an elementary graphical detect and delete algorithm that is obvious to anyone skilled in the art...". The applicants would like to respectfully draw the Examiner's attention to MPEP 2144.03 (A), (8th Edition, Rev. Feb. 2003, page 2100-132), "It would not be appropriate for the examiner to take official notice of facts without citing a prior art reference where the facts asserted to be well-known are not capable of instant and unquestionable demonstration as being well-known". Here, the applicant's invention is a specific technique to remove markups that is applied in an index and retrieval system. The applicants technique uses multiple direction scanning that detects and erases non-background pixels. Hence, it is not merely "...an elementary graphical detect and delete algorithm". Therefore, the applicants respectfully request the Examiner to withdraw rejection of claims 23-25 and allow the same.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is

believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Nov 7, 2003

By: Greg Stobbs
Gregory A. Stobbs
Reg. No. 28,764

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

GAS/HBS